REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated January 5, 2010 in which the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As indicated above, claims 1 and 9-11 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants respectfully point out that claim 10 claims a computer program embodied on a computer-readable medium. Therefore, since Applicants have limited the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that statutory subject matter is claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *David, et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0131764) in view of *Kikuchi, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,334).

David, et al. appears to disclose a recorder including a first generator for generating first material identifiers for identifying respective pieces of material on the medium such that each piece is differentiated from other pieces on the medium, and a second generator for generating second, universally unique, identifiers for pieces of material, the second identifiers being generated in respect of one or more of the first identifiers [0010]. The first identifiers, which need to distinguish the pieces of material on the medium, but need not be universally unique, and thus be smaller than universally unique identifiers [0012]. A camcorder 500 records video and audio material on a recording medium. A database processor 176 stores metadata which relates to the material recorded on the tape 126 [0090]. The metadata is linked to the material by UMIDs and by at least MURNs. The MURNs are intended to uniquely identify each piece of

material on the tape [0091]. MURNs are generated as the material is recorded on the tape [0093].

Thus, David, *et al.* merely discloses a first generator for generating first material identifier and a second generator for generating second, universally unique, identifiers. Nothing in *David, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests (a) generating management information during a record medium format process as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11. Rather, *David, et al.* merely discloses a first generator generating first material identifiers and a second generator for generating second universally unique identifiers.

Kikuchi, et al. appears to disclose a playback interrupt information table 124 which is a table in which a playback interrupt information is to be written, when the user interrupts, the playback is written. The information written in the table includes the title number of the title whose playback has been interrupted, the part-of-title number, the PGC number, the program number, the cell ID and the ID of the video object (column 11, lines 24-35).

Thus, *Kikuchi, et al.* merely discloses a playback interruption information table. Nothing in *Kikuchi, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests generating management information during a record medium format process as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11. Rather, *Kikuchi, et al.* only discloses a playback interruption information table.

A combination of *David, et al.* and *Kikuchi, et al.* would merely suggest that in addition to a first generator generating first material identifiers and a second generator for generating second identifiers as taught by *David, et al.* to include a playback interruption information table as taught by *Kikuchi, et al.* Thus, nothing in the combination of the references shows, teaches or suggests generating management information during a record medium format process as claimed

in claims 1 and 9-11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 would not have been obvious over *David, et al.* and *Kikuchi, et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: April 2, 2010

By: _____
Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
Tel. (202) 292-1530